REMARKS

I. Introduction

This paper addresses the Office Action of June 25, 2008, in connection with the above-captioned application. Concurrently herewith, Applicants are filing a Request for Continued Examination pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and paying the required fee set forth in § 1.17(e). Therefore, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(d), Applicants request that the finality of the June 25, 2008 Office Action be withdrawn and that the Office consider Applicants' current amendments and remarks.

Claims 1, 3-28, and 30-45 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3-28, and 30-45 have been rejected. Claims 37, 39, 41, 43, and 45 are canceled herein, without prejudice. Claims 1, 7, 15, 20, 23, 28, 32, and 34 are amended. The present amendment is supported by the original disclosure. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-13, 15-22, 28-35, 37, 39, 43, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-13, 15-22, 28-35, 37, 39, 43, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0167444 ("Zorc"), in view of Michael Koch, Leverage legacy systems with a blend of XML, XSL, and Java ("Koch"). Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, independent claims 1, 15, 23, 28, and 32 are amended herein. It is respectfully submitted that the present claims are patentable over the proposed combination of Zorc and Koch for at least the following reasons. As an initial matter, Applicants do not agree or admit that Koch is a proper prior art reference. In addition, to the extent this citation is relied on in any way in the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that the procedures set out in MPEP 2128 for electronic documents and the rules set out for reference citation in MPEP 707.05 must be complied with. Therefore, the rejection is traversed on these grounds.

Some example embodiments of the present invention provide systems, architectures, and methods of processing messages which may provide for a significant reduction in the amount of time, labor, and expense required in the development stages of a message transformation process. In example embodiments, a method of processing messages is provided which involves generating source code in a program language. The source code may be compiled and the compiled source code may be used to transform a payload message between the program language and an online transaction processing (OLTP) language. The source code may be generated automatically.

Accordingly, independent claim 1, as presented, recites:

> A method of processing messages comprising:
>
> receiving a markup language document describing a message, the markup language document being compliant with message rules associated with an OLTP language;
>
> receiving a template for a data format for the message in a program language;
>
> automatically generating source code in ~~a~~ the program language from the markup language document and the template;
>
> compiling the source code;
>
> **using the compiled source code to transform a payload message directly between the program language and the online transaction processing (OLTP) language**.

The proposed combination of Zorc and Koch does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 1, as presented. For example, neither Zorc nor Koch teaches or suggests "using the compiled source code to transform a payload message **directly** between the program language and the online transaction processing (OLTP) language." The Office Action generally asserts that Koch teaches the claimed element, pointing to Koch, Fig. 1. However, Koch, Fig. 1, does not detail the nature of any such transformation, depicting only a legacy transaction framework. Meanwhile, Koch itself explains that the system it describes does not transform a message "**directly** between the program language and the online transaction processing (OLTP) language," stating rather that "[d]ata manipulation transforms the response from a byte array or similar structure **into an XML document**." Koch, p. 2.

Zorc also does not teach or suggest transforming a message "**directly** between the program language and the online transaction processing (OLTP) language." Again Zorc itself states otherwise, explaining:

> Each application can include an application module and a conversion module. The conversion module may be automatically generated by the compilation mechanism of the present invention. For example, the first application 104 includes a first application module 105 for generating or receiving object-oriented code (e.g., Java objects). The first application 104 also includes a first conversion module 114 (e.g., a first XML message API). The first conversion module 114 converts **Java objects into XML messages** that may be sent to the second application 108 and converts **received XML messages into Java objects** for use by the first application module 105.

Accordingly, although Koch and Zorc may generally describe translating a message from a first format into XML format and then translating from XML format into a second format, the method of claim 1 permits a one-step process "using the compiled source code to transform a payload message **directly** between the program language and the online transaction processing (OLTP) language." Therefore, the proposed combination of Koch and Zorc does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 1, and it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the proposed combination of references, for at least the reasons presented above.

Independent claim 15, as presented, recites:

> A method of generating source code, comprising:
>
> receiving a markup language document, the markup language document being compliant with message rules associated with an online transaction processing (OLTP) language;
>
> receiving a template for a data format in a program language for a message; and
>
> **automatically generating a source code based on the markup language document and the template, the source code enabling transformation of a payload message directly between the program language and the OLTP language**.

The proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 15. For example, claim 15 recites "automatically generating a source code based on the markup language document and the template, the source code enabling transformation of a payload message **directly** between the program language and the OLTP language." Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is patentable over the proposed combination of Koch and Zorc.

Independent claim 28, as presented, recites:

> A message processing architecture comprising:
>
> a development module, the development module configured to receive a markup language document and a template for a data format in a program language, and configured to automatically generate a source code in the program language, the source code based on the markup language document and the template, the markup language document to be compliant with message rules associated with the OLTP language, and the source code to enable transformation of a message between the program language and the OLTP language;
>
> a program compiler, the program compiler to compile the source code; and
>
> **a message parser, the message parser to transform a payload message directly between the program language and the online transaction processing (OLTP) language using the compiled source code**.

The proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 28. For example, claim 28 recites "a message parser, the message parser to transform a payload message **directly** between the program language and the online transaction processing (OLTP) language using the compiled source code." Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 28 is patentable over the proposed combination of Koch and Zorc.

Independent claim 32, as presented, recites:

> A machine readable medium comprising a set of stored instructions capable of being executed by a processor to:
>
> receive a markup language document, the markup language document being compliant with message rules associated with an online transaction processing (OLTP) language;
>
> receive a template for a data format in a program language for a message; and
>
> automatically generate a source code based on the markup language document and the template, **the source code enabling transformation of a payload message directly between the program language and the OLTP language**.

The proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 32. For example, claim 32 recites "automatically generate a source code based on the markup language document and the template, the source code enabling transformation of a payload message **directly** between the program language and the OLTP language." Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 32 is patentable over the proposed combination of Koch and Zorc.

In addition, claims 3-14 and 36 depend from claim 1; claims 16-22 and 38 depend from claim 15; claims 30, 31, and 42 depend from claim 28; and claims 33-35 and 44 depend from claim 32. It is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable over the proposed combination of references for at least the reasons presented above in connection with independent claims 1, 15, 28, and 32. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 14, 23-27, 36, 38, 40-42, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 14, 23-27, 36, 38, 40-42, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Zorc and Koch, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,003,013 ("Boushy"). Although the rejection is not agreed with, independent claims 1, 15, 23, 28, and 32 are amended herein. Claims 14, 23-27, 36, 38, 40-42, and 44 are patentable over the proposed combination of Zorc, Koch, and Boushy for at least the reasons presented below.

First, the proposed combination of Zorc, Koch, and Boushy does not teach or suggest each of the elements of independent claim 23, as presented, which recites:

> A method of processing messages comprising:
>
> receiving one or more extensible markup language (XML) documents, the XML documents being compliant with message rules associated with an online transaction processing (OLTP) language, the OLTP language being a gaming system language and the message rules defining markup tags for describing components of the message;
>
> compiling the XML documents into source code in an object-oriented program language based on stylesheet data, the stylesheet data representing a program template for a payload message in the program language, **the source code enabling transformation of the payload message directly between the program language and the OLTP language**;
>
> compiling the source code;
>
> using the compiled source code to transform a message between the program language and the OLTP language, the source code being generated automatically; and
>
> repeating the receiving and compiling of XML documents and the compiling of source code for a plurality of message types.

For example, claim 23 recites "compiling the XML documents into source code in an object-oriented program language based on stylesheet data, the stylesheet data representing a program template for a payload message in the program language, the source code enabling transformation of the payload message **directly** between the program language and the OLTP language." Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 is patentable over the proposed combination of Koch and Zorc. In addition, the Office Action does not suggest that Boushy teaches or suggests "source code enabling transformation of the payload message **directly** between the program language and the OLTP language," and it is respectfully submitted that Boushy does not teach or suggest the element. Accordingly, for at least the reasons presented above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 is patentable over the proposed combination of Koch, Zorc, and Boushy.

In addition, claims 14 and 36 depend from claim 1; claim 38 depends from claim 15; claims 24-27 and 40 depend from claim 23; claim 42 depends from claim 28; and claim 44 depends from claim 32. As explained above, the proposed combination of Koch and Zorc does not teach or suggest each of the elements of the independent claims, as presented. The Office Action does not suggest that Boushy teaches or suggests the elements of the independent claims not taught or suggested by Koch and Zorc, and it is respectfully submitted that Boushy does not teach or suggest those elements. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the proposed combination of Koch, Zorc, and Boushy, as are dependent claims 14, 23-27, 36, 38, 40-42, and 44. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited. While no additional fee is considered to be due, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may arise out of the filing of this paper, or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to the deposit account of **K&L Gates LLP,** Deposit Account No. **080570**.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,
K&L Gates LLP

Dated: December 29, 2008

By: /Andrew L. Reibman/
Andrew L. Reibman
Reg. No. 47,893
K&L Gates LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022
(212) 536-3900 (telephone)
(212) 536-3901 (facsimile)
CUSTOMER NO. 00545

Electronic Filing System

NY-#653970-v1